

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/718,538

**Applicant(s)**

BERNARDON, JEAN-MICHEL

**Examiner**

Sabiha Qazi

**Art Unit**

1612

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2008.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 34 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 34 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11/24/03 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 1612

Claims 1-9 and 34 are pending. Amendments are entered. No claim is allowed.

**Summary of this Office Action dated January 2, 2009**

1. Double Patenting Rejections
2. Response to Remarks
3. Communication

***Double Patenting 1<sup>st</sup> Rejection***


1. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

2. Claims 1-9 and 34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 23 of prior U.S. Patent No. 6,689,922. This is a double patenting rejection. See compound lines 17 and 18 in column 106 which is first compound of claim 1 in present claims.

RN 268232-06-0 HCAPLUS

CN 1,2-Benzenedimethanol, 4-[2-[(1E,3E)-1,5-diethyl-5-hydroxy-1,3-heptadien-1-yl]phenyl]ethyl]- (CA INDEX NAME)



**Double Patenting 2<sup>nd</sup> Rejection**

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference

claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-9 and 34 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-42 of U.S. Patent No. 6,689,922. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because presently claimed invention has been generically claimed in the above cited patent. For example see compound disclosed in lines 38-41 in column 99, claim 15 where ethyl-octa are disclosed. In present claims ethyl-nona has been claimed. Addition of carbon in the compound would have been obvious. The prior art of record is drawn to structurally similar compounds, which differ, from the compounds embraced by the instant claims in that they are homologues. The skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify the teaching of the prior art to prepare homologues because it is recognized in the art that homologues are structurally similar and would be expected to possess similar properties. *Ex parte Henze* (POBA 1948) 83 USPQ 167.

Compounds that differ only by the presence of an extra methyl group are homologues. Homologues are of such close structural similarity that the disclosure of a compound renders prima facie obvious its homologue.

The homologue is expected to be prepared by the same method and to have the same

properties. This expectation is then deemed the motivation for preparing homologues. See *In re Wood* 199 USPQ 137; *In re Hoke* 195 USPQ 148; *In re Lohr* 137 USPQ 548; *In re Magerlein* 202 USPQ 473; *In re Wiechert* 152 USPQ 249; *Ex parte Henkel* 130 USPQ 474; *In re Fauque* 121 USPQ 425; *In re Druey* 138 USPQ 39.

Claims 1-9 and 34 are also generically taught in the prior patent. Instant claims differ from the reference in that they are of different generic scope. It had been held by Courts that the indiscriminate selection of “some” from among “many” is considered prima facie obvious. *In re Lemin*, 141 USPQ 814 (1964); *National Distillers and Chem. Corp. V. Brenner*, 156 USPQ 163.

The instant claimed compounds would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated to prepare compounds embraced by the genus of the above cited references with the expectation of obtaining additional beneficial compounds. The instant claimed compounds would have been suggested to one skilled in the art.

One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference since such compounds would have been suggested by the reference as a whole. It has been held that a prior art disclosed genus of useful compounds is sufficient to render prima facie obvious a species falling within the genus. *In re Susi*, 440 F.2d 442, 445, 169 USPQ 423, 425 (CCPA 1971), followed by the *Federal Circuit in Merck & Co. V. Biocraft Laboratories*, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ 2d 1843, 1846 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner’s ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have obvious to one skilled in the art.

**Response to Remarks**

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is withdrawn because claims are amended and arguments are found persuasive.

Claim 6 is drawn to composition and has been allowed as composition and not for its intended use because claim is drawn to "a pharmaceutical composition comprising an effective cell proliferation and differentiation affecting of at least one compound as defined by claim 1". Since the intended use includes the treatment of any disease caused by proliferation or differentiation the claim contain certain enablement issues. In order to advance the prosecution examiner called to discuss the issues with Attorney Gary D. Mangels. He agreed to amend the claims by Examiner's amendments. However, upon further review and consideration a double patenting rejections was noted which has been made on record.

**CONTACT INFORMATION**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi whose telephone number is (571) 272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day except Wednesday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Krass Frederick can be reached on (571) 272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sabiha Qazi/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1612